Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form				
Application No.: 10/550,126 Examiner: Andrey Belousoy	First Named Applicant: Masaru OKADA, et al. Art Unit: 2626 Status of Application. Office Action issued			
Tentative Participants: (1) Andrew Belousov	(2) Herbert F. Rusch	mann	<u> </u>	
(3) Supervisor/Primary	(4)			
Proposed Date of Interview: Aug. 6		Proposed Ti	ime: 2pm	(AM/PM)
Type of Interview Requested: (1) [×] Telephonic (2) [] Personal (3) [] Video Conference				
Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrat If yes, provide brief description:	ed: []YES	[]NO		
Issues To Be Discussed				
Issues Claims/ (Rej., Obj., etc) Fig. #s	Prior	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) 102 23-48	Art Opera	[]	[]	[]
(2)	***	[]	[]	[]
(3)		[]	[]	[]
(4)Sheer Attached		[]	[]	[]
Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented:				
An interview was conducted on the above-identified application ou NOTE: This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01). This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible H. Lengtherman				
Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature Examiner/SPE Signature				ature
Herbert F. Ruschmann Typed/Printed Name of Applicant or Representative				
35,341 Registration Number, if applic	_			

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.133. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 21 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any connected on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Parisi and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

PAGE 3/5* RCVD AT 8/4/2009 4:02:05 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-5/34 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:1212953/733 * DURATION (mm-ss):01-04

Docket No. F-8698

Scr. No. 10/550,126

Interview Request Continuation Sheet

Re: Claim 25-28, and 38-41.

Each of the claims is directed to a situation when the activated operating section corresponds to the presently opened window and requires that a certain function be performed in response to the activation of the section. The rejection of independent claim 23 interprets operating sections corresponding to windows as prior, current, and next windows (pg. 5) which have corresponding buttons 1, 2 and 5. See OA pg 3. paragraph c. With regard to each of the noted claims, 25-28, and 38-41, the rejection cites buttons used by Opera, i.e., buttons 3, F2, F4 and an unknown button for "Access active bookmark folder" to effect a function listed which the Examiner considers to correspond to a function of the given claim. None of the cited buttons is an activated operating section that corresponds to the presently opened window.

It is submitted that regardless of how the Examiner is interpreting what constitutes buttons corresponding to windows, the rejection cannot be sustained because none of the buttons cited in the rejections corresponds to any of buttons 1, 2 and 5 chosen as the corresponding buttons in the rejection of the independent claims.

Re claim 48.

Claim 48 recites:

each of the operating sections on the remote controller fixedly corresponds to one of the windows such that correspondence between operating sections and the windows remains the same after the execution of the step of switching.

Docket No. F-8698

Ser. No. 10/550,126

Interview Request Continuation Sheet

It is submitted that the Examiner's interpretation is inconsistent with the claim language. The rejection chooses to interpret Opera buttons corresponding to "previous, next and current" as the operating sections corresponding to windows. It is clear that the windows associated with the named operating sections, i.e. buttons, of Opera do not remain the same after the corresponding button is pressed. While the names "previous" "next" and "current" may be the same, the window that appears when these keys are repeatedly pressed does not remain the same. Hence, claim 48 is submitted as clearly not being anticipated.

Re: Independent Claims 23 and 37.

If required, claim language will be discussed to effect what the Examiner will consider as relating correspondence between operating sections and windows and assigned content of windows.